1 2 3 4	SOMACH, SIMMONS & DUNN A Professional Corporation SANDRA K. DUNN, ESQ. (SBN 119161) 813 Sixth Street, Third Floor Sacramento, CA 95814-2403 Telephone: (916) 446-7979 Facsimile: (916) 446-8199	20% SCP + 3	
5 6	Attorneys for COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO and SACRAMENTO COUNTY Water AGENCY	6	
7		er-uit	
8	STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD		
9			
10	In the Matter of: The Proposed Revocation of	CASE NO.	
11	Permits 16209, 16210, 16211, and 16212 For the Auburn Dam Project	CLOSING BRIEF OF COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO	
12		COUNTY WATER AGENCY	
13			
14	I. INTROD	UCTION	
15	The Lower American River has long been r	ecognized as a resource of extraordinary value	
16	Few equivalents in the State of California or throughout the United States exist. Since at least		
17	1959, Sacramento County has actively pursued a strategy aimed at protecting the Lower		
18	American River.		
19	It is the position of Sacramento County that	in pursuing the proposed revocation of the	
20			
21	United States Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) Auburn Dam permits, the State Water		
22	Resources Control Board (SWRCB) must consider	and guard against any unintended	
23	consequences of its decision. Whether Reclamatio	n's permits are revoked or not, the SWRCB	
24	must ensure that water currently held by Reclamation is preserved for use in implementing		
25	protective, durable and enforceable flow standards on the Lower American River and for the		
26	protection of other public trust and beneficial uses within the American River watershed.		
27			
28			

# II. THE SWRCB DECISION'S SHOULD NOT IMPAIR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WATER FORUM AGREEMENT AND MUST BE GUIDED BY SACRAMENTO COUNTY'S AMERICAN RIVER PARKWAY PLAN

As Tom Gohring, Executive Director of the Water Forum, explained in his testimony to the SWRCB, the Water Forum Agreement was executed in 2000, and establishes two co-equal objectives: providing a reliable and safe water supply for the region's economic health and planned development to the year 2030; and preserving the fishery, wildlife, recreational and aesthetic values of the Lower American River. (Sacramento County Exh. 2.)

The co-equal objectives of the Water Forum Agreement are also embedded into the American River Parkway Plan (Parkway Plan). (See Testimony of Keith DeVore, Sacramento County Exhibit 1; see also Sacramento County Exh. 3 at p. 77.) Water Flow Policy 4.1 of the draft final Parkway Plan is aimed at protecting the fishery, wildlife, recreational, and aesthetic values of the Lower American River. It states the intent of the Parkway Plan that "available water flows protect the Lower American River" resources. The Water Flow Policy specifically incorporates the minimum flow regime agreed to by Reclamation and the Water Forum in 2006, known as the Flow Management Standards for the Lower American River. (Sacramento County Exh. 3 at p. 77.)

The Parkway Plan additionally seeks to protect the region's surface water supplies. Water Flow Policy 4.3 expressly states: "New surface water diversions that deplete flows in the Lower American river, whether by execution of a new contract or new water right to serve entities outside the American River watershed are inconsistent with this American River Parkway Plan." (Sacramento County Exh. 3 at p. 77.)

The Urban American River Parkway Preservation Act requires State Departments, when carrying out their respective responsibilities involving or impacting the Lower American River, be directed by the American River Parkway Plan. (Pub. Resources Code, § 5842.) Accordingly,

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

the SWRCB must be guided by the Parkway Plan's Water Flow policies as it decides the question before it revokes Reclamation's permits.

### III. THE SWRCB'S DECISION SHOULD NOT BE AN OBSTACLE TO DECLARING THE AMERICAN RIVER FULLY APPROPRIATED

The Water Forum Agreement identifies the need to modify the SWRCB's Declaration of Fully Appropriated Streams as it currently pertains to the American River as an important component of meeting its overall objectives. The Water Forum Agreement states:

The State Water Resources Control Board has already declared the American River to be fully appropriated during certain times of the year. In recognition of the additional diversions and fishery flows agreed to in the Water Forum Agreement, the Declaration of Full Appropriation needs to be amended. Because there are significant remaining issues including area of origin protections, this will require additional negotiation. Signatories agree to negotiate with all affected stakeholders and the Water Forum Successor Effort will recommend an amendment to the Declaration of Full Appropriation for the American River consistent with the Water Forum Agreement. Timing of this assurance: A recommended amendment to the Declaration of Full Appropriation for the Lower American River will be developed so that the amended Declaration can be recommended as soon as the Lower American River flow standard is updated. (Sacramento County Exh. 4 at p. 138.)

While Sacramento County agrees with testimony of Kathy Mrowka, that revocation of Reclamation's Auburn Dam permits will not itself change the existing Declaration of Fully Appropriated Stream Order for the American River, it will, at least on paper, make additional water available for appropriation during other months of the year. (Transcript at pp. 258-259.) This would potentially serve as an obstacle to the Water Forum in its efforts to modify the scope of the Declaration.

The Declaration of Fully Appropriated Stream Order provides that the American River is fully appropriated during the period of July 1 through October 31. Other months, however, are also critical to the operation and management of the American River for the protection of the fisheries. As part of the improved flow standards for the Lower American River, the Water

1	
, 2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	ĺ
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

28

Forum will seek to modify the Declaration of Fully Appropriated Streams Order for the American River.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

As it makes its decision regarding revocation of Reclamation's permits, the SWRCB should guard against creating an impediment to the Water Forum's implementation of the Water Form Agreement. Thus, whatever the SWRCB's decision regarding Auburn Dam, Sacramento County requests that the SWRCB expressly preserve the water under the permits to facilitate the implementation of flow standards on the Lower American River and for other public trust and beneficial uses within the American River watershed.

Respectfully submitted,

SOMACH SIMMONS & DUNN

Dated: September 3, 2008

Attorneys for County of Sacramento and Sacramento County Water Agency

## PROOF OF SERVICE

7 · 

I am employed in the County of Sacramento; my business address is Hall of Justice Building, 813 Sixth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, California; I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the foregoing action.

On September 3, 2008, I served a true and correct copy of

# CLOSING BRIEF OF COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO AND SACRAMENTO COUNTY WATER AGENCY

X (by electronic service) I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing will be e-served on September 3, 2008 as listed below:

Michael B. Jackson	miatty@sbcglobal.net
Michael R. Schaefer	mikeret 99@vahoo.com
Jon D. Rubin	
Thomas J. Shephard	
	dgillick@neumiller.com
David Rose	drose@waterboards.ca.gov
Christopher D. Williams	cwilliam@goldrush.com
Michael Garabedian	mikeg@gvn.net
Ronald M. Stork	rstork@friendsoftheriver.org
James E. Turner	
John Herrick	
Karna E. Harrigfeld	

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct under the laws of the State of California. Executed on September 3, 2008, at Sacramento, California.

Susan Bentley